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## Introduction

In many instances in measuring multidimensional data, as matrices and tensors, one confronts the following problems: noisy data, missing entries and data reduction.
There are many statistical and mathematical methods to deal with these problems. In this talk we discuss a few methods that the speaker was working on.

## Cameraman I



## Cameraman II



## Statement of the 2-dimensional problem

2-D data is presented in terms of a matrix

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
a_{1,1} & a_{1,2} & \ldots & a_{1, n} \\
a_{2,1} & a_{2,2} & \ldots & a_{2, n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
a_{m, 1} & a_{m, 2} & \ldots & a_{m, n}
\end{array}\right]
$$

## Examples

(1) digital picture: $512 \times 512$ matrix of pixels,
(2) DNA-microarrays: $60,000 \times 30$
(rows are genes and columns are experiments),
(3) web pages activities:
$a_{i, j}$-the number of times webpage $j$ was accessed from web page $i$.

Objective: denoise, condense and store data effectively.

## Least squares \& best rank $k$-matrix approximation

Least Squares: given $\mathbf{a}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ find the best approximations $\mathbf{b}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ lying in the subspace spanned by $\mathbf{f}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{f}_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ History Gauss (1794) 1809, Legendre 1805, Adrain 1808

SOL: $A=\left[\begin{array}{lll}\mathbf{a}_{1} & \ldots & \mathbf{a}_{n}\end{array}\right]=\left[a_{i j}\right], B=\left[\mathbf{b}_{1} \ldots \mathbf{b}_{n}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$,
$\|A-B\|_{F}^{2}:=\sum_{i, j}\left|a_{i j}-b_{i j}\right|^{2}, F=\left[\mathbf{f}_{1} \ldots \mathbf{f}_{k}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}, X \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$
$\min _{X \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}}\|A-F X\|_{F}^{2}$ achieved for $X^{\star}=F^{\dagger} A, B^{\star}=F F^{\dagger} A$
$F^{\dagger}$-Moore-Penrose inverse 1920, 1955
Singular Value Decomposition:
In LS find the best $r$-dimensional subspace
$\min _{X \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}, F \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times r}}\|A-F X\|_{F}^{2}$ achieved for $A_{r}:=\left(F^{\star}\right)^{\dagger} X^{\star}$
History Beltrami 1873, C. Jordan 1874, Sylvester 1889, E. Schmidt 1907, H. Weyl 1912
Story: Gene Golub

## Singular Value Decomposition - SVD

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=U \Sigma V^{\top} \\
& \Sigma=\operatorname{diag}\left(\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{\min (m, n)}\right):=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma_{1} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
0 & \sigma_{2} & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \ldots & \sigma_{n} \\
0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots
\end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \\
& \sigma_{1} \geq \ldots \geq \sigma_{r}>0=\sigma_{i}, i>r=\operatorname{rank} A \\
& U=\left[\mathbf{u}_{1} \ldots \mathbf{u}_{m}\right] \in \mathbb{O}(m), \quad V=\left[\mathbf{v}_{1} \ldots \mathbf{v}_{n}\right] \in \mathbb{O}(n) \\
& a^{\dagger}=a^{-1} \text { if } a \in \mathbb{R} \backslash\{0\}, a^{\dagger}=0 \text { if } a=0 \\
& A^{\dagger}:=V \operatorname{diag}\left(\sigma_{1}^{\dagger}, \ldots, \sigma_{\min (m, n)}^{\dagger}\right) U^{\top} \\
& A A^{\top}=U \operatorname{diag}\left(\sigma_{1}^{2}, \ldots, \sigma_{r}^{2}, 0, \ldots, 0\right) U^{\top}-\text { Spectral decomposition of } A A^{\top}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Best rank k-approximation

For $k \leq r=\operatorname{rank} A: \Sigma_{k}=\operatorname{diag}\left(\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{k}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$,
$U_{k}=\left[\mathbf{u}_{1} \ldots \mathbf{u}_{k}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}, V_{k}=\left[\mathbf{v}_{1} \ldots \mathbf{v}_{k}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$
$A_{k}:=U_{k} \Sigma_{k} V_{k}^{\top}$ is the best rank $k$ approximation in Frobenius and operator norm of $A$

$$
\min _{B \in \mathcal{R}(m, n, k)}\|A-B\|_{F}=\left\|A-A_{k}\right\|_{F}
$$

Reduced SVD $A=U_{r} \Sigma_{r} V_{r}^{\top}$
$(r \geq) \nu$ numerical rank of $A$ if

$$
\frac{\sum_{i \geq \nu+1} \sigma_{i}^{2}}{\sum_{i \geq 1} \sigma_{i}^{2}} \approx 0,(0.01)
$$

$A_{\nu}$ is a noise reduction of $A$. Noise reduction has many applications in image processing, DNA-Microarrays analysis, data compression. Full SVD: $O(m n \min (m, n)), k-$ SVD: $O(k m n)$.

## CUR approximation-I

From $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ choose submatrices consisting of $p$-columns $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ and $q$ rows $R \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n}$

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
a_{1,1} & a_{1,2} & a_{1,3} & \ldots & a_{1, n} \\
a_{2,1} & a_{2,2} & a_{2,3} & \ldots & a_{2, n} \\
a_{3,1} & a_{3,2} & a_{3,3} & \ldots & a_{3, n} \\
a_{4,1} & a_{4,2} & a_{4,3} & \ldots & a_{4, n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\
a_{m-1,1} & a_{m-1,2} & a_{m-1,3} & \ldots & a_{m-1, n} \\
a_{m, 1} & a_{m, 2} & a_{m, 3} & \ldots & a_{m, n}
\end{array}\right]
$$

$R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$ - red - blue, $\quad C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ - red - magenta.
Approximate $A$ using $C, R$ : by $A=C U R$,
by "best chosen" $U \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$

## CUR approximation-II

Given $A$ the best choice of $U$ is
$U_{b} \in \arg \min _{U \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}}\|A-C U R\|_{F}$
$U_{b}=C^{\dagger} A R^{\dagger}$
Complexity: $O(p q m n)$.
A good choice $U=A[I, J]^{\dagger}$
Needs to find with certain maximal properties:
Having the product of all nonzero singular values of $A[I, J]$ maximal

Done by going through a finite random choices of $I, J$

## Simulations: Tire I



Figure: Tire image compression (a) original, (b) SVD approximation, (c) CLS approximation, $t_{\max }=100$.

Figure 1 portrays the original image of the Tire picture from the Image Processing Toolbox of MATLAB, given by a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{205 \times 232}$ of rank 205, the image compression given by the SVD (using the MATLAB function svds) of rank 30 and the image compression given by $B_{b}=C U_{b} R$.

## Simulations: Tire II

The corresponding image compressions given by the approximations $B_{\text {opt }_{1}}, B_{\text {opt }_{2}}$ and $\tilde{B}_{\text {opt }}$ are displayed respectively in Figure 2. Here, $t_{\max }=100$ and $p=q=30$. Note that the number of trials $t_{\max }$ is set to the large value of 100 for all simulations in order to be able to compare results for different (small and large) matrices.


Figure: Tire image compression with (a) $B_{o p t_{1}}$, (b) $B_{o p t_{2}}$, (c) $\tilde{B}_{o p t}, t_{\max }=100$.

## DNA Microarrays: I

A DNA microarray (also commonly known as gene chip, DNA chip, or biochip) is a collection of microscopic DNA spots attached to a solid surface. Scientists use DNA microarrays to measure the expression levels of large numbers of genes simultaneously or to genotype multiple regions of a genome. Each DNA spot contains picomoles (10-12 moles) of a specific DNA sequence, known as probes (or reporters).

## DNA Microarrays: II



Figure: Microarays raw data

## DNA Microarrays: III



Figure: Microarays processed data

## Missing entries in DNA Microarrays

During the laboratory process, some spots on the array may be missing due to various factors (for example, machine error.) Because it is often very costly or time consuming to repeat the experiment, molecular biologists, statisticians, and computer scientists have made attempts to recover the missing gene expressions by some ad-hoc and systematic methods.

## Gene expression matrix

$E=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}g_{11} & g_{12} & \ldots & g_{1 m} \\ g_{21} & g_{22} & \ldots & g_{2 m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{j 1} & g_{j 2} & \ldots & g_{j m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{n 1} & g_{n 2} & \ldots & g_{n m}\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}\mathbf{g}_{1}^{\top} \\ \mathbf{g}_{2}^{\top} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{g}_{j}^{\top} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{g}_{n}^{\top}\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{llll}\mathbf{c}_{1} & \mathbf{c}_{2} & \ldots & \mathbf{c}_{m}\end{array}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$
$\mathbf{g}_{j}^{\top}:=\left(g_{j 1}, g_{j 2}, \ldots, g_{j m}\right), j=1, \ldots, n, \mathbf{c}_{i}=\left[\begin{array}{c}g_{1 i} \\ g_{2 i} \\ \vdots \\ g_{j i} \\ \vdots \\ g_{n i}\end{array}\right], i=1, \ldots, m$.
$\mathbf{g}_{j}^{\top}$ relative expression levels of $j^{\text {th }}$ gene in $m$ experiments.
$\mathbf{c}_{i}$ relative expression levels of $n$ genes in $i^{\text {th }}$ experiment
$n \gg m$

## Missing entries problem in DNA Microarrays

$\mathcal{N} \subset[n]:=\{1, \ldots, n\}$ the set of rows of $E$ that contain at least one missing entry.

For each $j \in \mathcal{N}^{c}:=[n] \backslash \mathcal{N}$, the gene $\mathbf{g}_{j}^{\top}$ has all of its entries.
$n^{\prime}$ denote the size of $\mathcal{N}^{c}$, i.e. the size of $\mathcal{N}$ is $n-n^{\prime}$.

Problem: complete the missing entries of each $\mathbf{g}_{j}^{\top}, j \in \mathcal{N}$, under some assumptions.

## Fixed Rank Approximation Algorithm (FRAA): I

$\sigma_{1}^{2}(A) \geq \sigma_{2}(A)^{2} \geq \ldots$ are the eigenvalues of $A A^{\top}$ and $A^{\top} A$.
Ky-Fan characterization

$$
\sum_{i=\nu+1}^{m} \sigma_{i}(A)^{2}=\min _{\left[\mathbf{x}_{\nu+1} \ldots \mathbf{x}_{m}\right] \in \mathbb{O}(m, m-\nu)} \sum_{i=\nu+1}^{m}\left(A \mathbf{x}_{i}\right)^{\top}\left(A \mathbf{x}_{i}\right)
$$

$\mathbb{O}(m, k) \subset \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ all matrices with $k$ orthonormal columns $\Omega \subset\{1, \ldots, n\} \times\{1, \ldots, m\}$ missing entries set.

Set $g_{i j}=0$ if $(i, j) \in \Omega$ to obtain $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$.
$\mathcal{X}$ are all $X=\left[x_{i j}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ where $x_{i j}=0$ if $(i, j) \notin \Omega$.
Assume that the completed matrix of the experiment should have the numerical rank $\nu$. Then we complete the entries by solving the problem:

## FRAA: II

(1) $\min _{X \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i=\nu+1}^{m} \sigma_{i}^{2}(E+X)=\min _{X \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i=\nu+1}^{m} \lambda_{i}\left((E+X)^{\top}(E+X)\right)$

Fixed Rank Approximation Algorithm: [4]
$G_{p} \in \mathcal{X}$ is $p^{t h}$ approximation to a solution of optimization problem (1).
Let $B_{p}:=\left(E+G_{p}\right)^{\top}\left(E+G_{p}\right)$
Find an orthonormal set of eigenvectors for $B_{p}, \mathbf{v}_{p, 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{p, m}$.
Then $G_{p+1}$ is a solution to the following minimum of a convex nonnegative quadratic function

$$
\min _{X \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{q=l+1}^{m}\left((E+X) \mathbf{v}_{p, q}\right)^{\top}\left((E+X) \mathbf{v}_{p, q}\right)
$$

## Fixed Rank Approximation Algorithm (IFRAA)

FRAA is a robust algorithm which performs good, but not as well as KNNimpute, BPCA and LSSimpute.
All other algo reconstruct the missing values of each gene from similar genes.

First use FRAA to find a completion $G$.
Then use a cluster algorithm
(We used K-means repeating \& refining cluster size), to find a reasonable number of clusters of similar genes,
each cluster is a relatively smaller matrix having an effective low rank.

For each cluster of genes apply FRAA separately to recover the missing entries in this cluster [3].

## SIMULATIONS 1



## SIMULATIONS 2



## Missing entries for 3-tensors

$\mathcal{T}=\left[t_{i, j, k}\right]_{i=j=k=1}^{n, m, l} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m \times l}$.
$\Omega \subset\{1, \ldots, n\} \times\{1, \ldots, m\} \times\{1, \ldots, I\}$ missing entries set
Simple solution: Assume $1, \ldots, n$ are genes
Unfold $\mathcal{T}$ in direction 1 to get the matrix $E=\left[g_{i(j, k)}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times(m l)}$ where $g_{i(j, k)}=t_{i, j, k}$.

Apply your favorite completion algorithm for matrices

## ( $p, q, r$ )-approximation of 3-tensors

$\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}, \mathbf{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}, \mathbf{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\prime}$ of dimensions $p, q, r$ respectively with orthonormal bases $\left[\mathbf{u}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{p}\right],\left[\mathbf{v}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{q}\right],\left[\mathbf{w}_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{r}\right]$
$P_{\mathbf{U} \otimes \vee \otimes \mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{T})=\sum_{i=j=k}^{p, q, r}\left\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{u}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{v}_{j} \otimes \mathbf{w}_{k}\right\rangle \mathbf{u}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{v}_{j} \otimes \mathbf{w}_{k}$
$\left(\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{z}\rangle=\sum_{i=j=k=1}^{n, m, I} t_{i, j, k} x_{i} y_{j} z_{k}\right)$
$\|\mathcal{T}\|_{H S}^{2}:=\left.\left\|\left.P_{\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{V} \otimes \mathbf{W}}(\mathcal{T})\right|_{H S} ^{2}+\right\| P_{(\mathbf{U} \otimes V \otimes \mathbf{W})^{\perp}}(\mathcal{T})\right|_{H S} ^{2}$
$\left(\|\left. P_{\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{V} \otimes \mathbf{W}}(\mathcal{T})\right|_{H S} ^{2}:=\sum_{i=j=k=1}^{p, q, r}\left\langle\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{u}_{i} \otimes \mathbf{v}_{j} \otimes \mathbf{w}_{k}\right\rangle^{2}\right)$
(Best) $(p, q, r)$-approximation $P_{\mathbf{U} \star \otimes \mathbf{V} * \otimes \mathbf{W}^{*}}(\mathcal{T})$ :
$\arg \max \left\|P_{\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{V} \otimes \mathbf{W}}(\mathcal{T})\right\|_{H S}=\arg \min \left\|P_{(\mathbf{U} \otimes \vee \otimes \mathbb{W})^{\perp}}(\mathcal{T})\right\|_{\text {нs }}$

## Fixed Rank Approximation Algorithm for Tensors

$\Phi_{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times m \times I}$ all tensors $\mathcal{X}=\left[x_{i, j, k}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m \times I}$
with $x_{i, j, k}=0$ if $(i, j, k) \notin \Omega$.
$\mathcal{T}=\left[t_{i, j, k}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m \times I}, t_{i, j, k}=0$ if $(i, j, k) \in \Omega$.
$\mathcal{X}_{0}$ an approximation of completed errors

Assume $\mathcal{X}_{s}$ given.
Find $(p, q, r)$-approximation of $\mathcal{T}+\mathcal{X}_{s}$ with corresponding subspaces $\mathbf{U}_{s}, \mathbf{V}_{s}, \mathbf{W}_{s}$.

Then $\mathcal{X}_{s+1}:=\arg \min \left\{\left\|P_{\left(\mathbf{U}_{s} \otimes \mathbf{V}_{s} \otimes \mathbf{W}_{s}\right)^{\perp}}(\mathcal{T}+\mathcal{X})\right\|_{H S}, \mathcal{X}, \in \Phi\right\}$.
$\mathcal{X}_{s}$ converges to a critical semi-local minimum
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